



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,273	09/24/2003	Richard Cudd	00169.002753.	3494

5514 7590 05/14/2009
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

DULANEY, BENJAMIN O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/14/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/668,273

Applicant(s)

CUDD ET AL.

Examiner

BENJAMIN O. DULANEY

Art Unit

2625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 9-11 referring to Simpson not teaching the newly amended feature, filed 2/12/09, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-3, 5-9 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of U.S. patent 6,832,351 by Batres.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as not falling within one of the four statutory categories of invention. Supreme Court precedent^[1] and recent Federal Circuit decisions^[2] indicate that a statutory "process" under 35 U.S.C. 101 must (1) be tied to an apparatus or a machine or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or material) to a different state or thing. While the instant claim(s) recite a series of steps or acts to be performed, the claim(s) neither transform underlying subject matter nor positively tie to another statutory category that accomplishes the claimed method steps, and therefore do not qualify as a statutory process. Furthermore, the tie

must be meaningful. A machine tied only to an intended use statement or to insignificant pre or post solution activity is not a meaningful tie. The tie must be in relation to a step or steps that are significant to the invention, or basic inventive concept. For example, the steps of claims 1-11, such as recording, identifying, determining and establishing the display order of said frames are not tied to a particular apparatus. The tie must be claimed outside the preamble.

^[1] *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876).

^[2] *In re Bilski*, 88 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4) Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application publication 2004/0201613 by Simpson et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,978,445 by Laane, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,832,351 by Batres.

5) Regarding claims 1, 14 and 15, Simpson teaches a method of forming a printable representation of a document having framed content, said method comprising the steps of: (a) recording the position, height and width of each frame of said document in a display widow in which said document is presented (paragraph 59; in order to place frames on the display in a specific location, it is inherent that the position and size of the object are recorded), (b) identifying dimensions of a printing medium associated with said printable representation (figure 7, item 290); (c) determining a height of content of each said frame (paragraph 59); (e) interpreting the records to establish a display order of said frames (paragraph 61); (f) for each said frame, and in said display order: (fb) creating a display region upon a page in said printable representation at said start position according to said corresponding content height (figure 6); (fc) placing the content of said frame into said display region (paragraph 59).

Simpson does not specifically teach (d) determining, for each said frame, a record of any corresponding dependency frames, each said dependency frame being above said frame in said display window; (fa) checking a start position of said frame against an end position of a created display region of a frame upon which said frame is dependent, and setting said start position to be said end position; (fd) where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminating the display region at the page limit and creating a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation so as to span the content of said frame across the display region and the further display region.

Laane teaches (d) determining, for each said frame, a record of any corresponding dependency frames, each said dependency frame being above said frame in said display window (column 5, lines 38-41); (fa) checking a start position of said frame against an end position of a created display region of a frame upon which said frame is dependent, and setting said start position to be said end position (figure 3, items 310a and 310b).

Simpson and Laane are combinable because they are both from the internet display field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Laane to add frame dependency. The motivation for doing so would have been to correctly display a loaded page (column 5, lines 38-41).

Batres teaches (fd) where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminating the display region at the page limit and creating a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation so as to span the content of said frame across the display region and the further display region (column 8, lines 29-40; Simpson specifically allows for the user to "arbitrarily arrange" [paragraph 53] and for the user to be able to "select from among individual constituent portions of each page" [paragraph 57], therefore Simpson could easily incorporate the improvement specifically taught by Batres).

Simpson and Batres are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Batres to add spanning pages with overflow data. The motivation for doing so would have been so that "overflow data is properly merged therewith" (abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Simpson, Batres and Laane to obtain the invention as specified by claims 1, 14 and 15.

6) Regarding claim 2, Simpson teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein step (c) comprises: (ca) determining a width of said content of each said frame; (cb) determining a scaling factor by which the content width of said frame need be adjusted to correspond to a corresponding display width of said frame in said display window; and step (fb) further comprises scaling the content of said frame according to said scaling factor to fit within said display width (paragraph 51).

7) Regarding claim 3, Simpson teaches a method according to claim 2 wherein step (fb) comprises: (i) applying a zoom to the display region corresponding to the scaling factor; and (ii) expanding a width of the display region by the inverse of the scaling factor to thereby reveal content otherwise obscured (paragraph 59).

8) Regarding claim 5, Simpson does not specifically teach A method according to claim 1 wherein step (d) comprises forming a linear array of records incorporating links from records of dependent ones of said frames to frames from which they depend.

Laane teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein step (d) comprises forming a linear array of records incorporating links from records of dependent ones of said frames to frames from which they depend (column 5, lines 6-8; a script would

execute linearly and an array is a very well known in the art data structure that would be obvious to use).

Simpson and Laane are combinable because they are both from the internet display field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Laane to add frame dependency. The motivation for doing so would have been to correctly display a loaded page (column 5, lines 38-41). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Simpson and Laane to obtain the invention as specified by claim 5.

9) Regarding claim 6, Simpson teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein no account is taken of horizontal dependency between said frames (Simpson does not teach anything dealing with horizontal dependency and therefore teaches that no account of it is taken).

10) Regarding claim 7, Simpson teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein said printable representation is a print preview representation (figure 4).

11) Regarding claim 8, Simpson teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein said printable representation comprises at least part of a print job dispatched to a printer (paragraph 22).

12) Regarding claim 9, Simpson teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein said document comprises an HTML document defining a Web page (paragraph 24, 25, 38 and 39).

13) Regarding claim 13, Simpson teaches a computer program according to claim 14 wherein said program forms a sub-application associated with a browser application and having a graphical user interface formed with a graphical user interface of said browser application (paragraph 30).

14) Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application publication 2004/0201613 by Simpson et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,978,445 by Laane, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,832,351 by Batres, and further in view of U.S. patent application publication 2002/0046238 by Estavillo et al.

Simpson does not specifically teach a method according to claim 1 wherein step (b) comprises reducing said dimensions by margin dimensions to be formed in said printable representation.

Estavillo teaches a method according to claim 1 wherein step (b) comprises reducing said dimensions by margin dimensions to be formed in said printable representation (paragraph 49; figure 8).

Simpson and Estavillo are combinable because they are both from the print preview field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Estavillo to add margin dimensions. The motivation for doing so would have been to "show an accurate preview" (paragraph 49).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Simpson and Estavillo to obtain the invention as specified by claim 4.

15) Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application publication 2004/0201613 by Simpson et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,978,445 by Laane, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,832,351 by Batres, and further in view of U.S. patent application publication 2002/0143814 by Hepworth et al.

Regarding claim 10, Simpson teaches a method of forming a printable representation of a document having framed content, said method comprising the steps of: (a) recording the position, height and width of each frame of said document in a display widow in which said document is presented (paragraph 59; in order to place frames on the display in a specific location, it is inherent that the position and size of the object are recorded), (b) identifying dimensions of a printing medium associated with said printable representation (figure 7, item 290); (c) determining a height of content of each said frame (paragraph 59); (e) interpreting the records to establish a display order of said frames (paragraph 61); (f) for each said frame, and in said display order: (fb) creating a display region upon a page in said printable representation at said start position according to said corresponding content height (figure 6); (fc) placing the content of said frame into said display region (paragraph 59).

Simpson does not specifically teach a method of forming a printable representation of a Web page, said method comprising: (i) detecting one of a print or a

print preview selection for said Web page from a Web browser application; (ii) examining a definition of said Web page for the presence of frames; and (iii) where step (ii) detects the presence of at least one frame in said Web page. (d) determining, for each said frame, a record of any corresponding dependency frames, each said dependency frame being above said frame in said display window; (fa) checking a start position of said frame against an end position of a created display region of a frame upon which said frame is dependent, and setting said start position to be said end position; (fd) where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminating the display region at the page limit and creating a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation so as to span the content of said frame across the display region and the further display region.

Laane teaches (d) determining, for each said frame, a record of any corresponding dependency frames, each said dependency frame being above said frame in said display window (column 5, lines 38-41); (fa) checking a start position of said frame against an end position of a created display region of a frame upon which said frame is dependent, and setting said start position to be said end position (figure 3, items 310a and 310b).

Simpson and Laane are combinable because they are both from the internet display field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Laane to add frame dependency. The

motivation for doing so would have been to correctly display a loaded page (column 5, lines 38-41).

Batres teaches (fd) where said display region exceeds a page limit in said printable representation, terminating the display region at the page limit and creating a further display region upon a following page of the printable representation so as to span the content of said frame across the display region and the further display region (column 8, lines 29-40; Simpson specifically allows for the user to "arbitrarily arrange" [paragraph 53] and for the user to be able to "select from among individual constituent portions of each page" [paragraph 57], therefore Simpson could easily incorporate the improvement specifically taught by Batres).

Simpson and Batres are combinable because they are both from the printing field of endeavor.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Batres to add spanning pages with overflow data. The motivation for doing so would have been so that "overflow data is properly merged therewith" (abstract).

Hepworth teaches a method of forming a printable representation of a Web page, said method comprising: (i) detecting one of a print or a print preview selection for said Web page from a Web browser application (paragraph 57); (ii) examining a definition of said Web page for the presence of frames; and (iii) where step (ii) detects the presence of at least one frame in said Web page (paragraph 55, 56 and 44).

Simpson and Hepworth are combinable because they are both from the internet display.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Hepworth to add frame detection. The motivation for doing so would have been for "enhancing a material with machine readable graphical codes" (abstract).

Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Simpson, Laane, Batres and Hepworth to obtain the invention as specified by claim 10.

16) Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent application publication 2004/0201613 by Simpson et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 6,978,445 by Laane, and further in view of U.S. patent 6,832,351 by Batres, and further in view of U.S. patent application publication 2002/0143814 by Hepworth et al., and further in view of U.S. patent 7,047,033 by Wyler.

Simpson does not specifically teach a method according to claim 10, further comprising the step of: (iv) where step (ii) fails to detect the presence of a frame, forming the printable representation according to the browser application.

Wyler teaches a method according to claim 10, further comprising the step of: (iv) where step (ii) fails to detect the presence of a frame, forming the printable representation according to the browser application (column 35, lines 3-15; when frames are detected a special browser is used, when not detected a different browser is used, therefore the limitation is satisfied).

Simpson and Wyler are combinable because they are both from the internet display.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Simpson with Wyler to add forming a printable representation according to the browser. The motivation for doing so would have been "to determine whether ... special features were supported" (column 35, lines 5-7). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Simpson and Wyler to obtain the invention as specified by claim 11.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN O. DULANEY whose telephone number is (571)272-2874. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (10am - 6pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Benjamin O Dulaney/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625